



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/346,884	07/02/1999	NIRAT BHUPESH SHAH	14013-23	3005

27728 7590 08/08/2002

LAW OFFICES OF IMAM
111 N. MARKET STREET, SUITE 1010
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

LY, ANH VU H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2662

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2002

5

Remailed

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/346,884	07/02/1999	NIRAT BHUPESH SHAH	14013-23	3005

7590 07/23/2002

MARYAM IMAM ESQ
LAW OFFICES OF IMAM
TWO NORTH SECOND STREET
SUITE 1100
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

LY, ANH VU H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2662

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

70

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/346,884

Applicant(s)

SHAH, NIRAT BHUPESH

Examiner

Anh-Vu H Ly

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14-16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 1, 5-13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vargo et al (US Patent No. 6,356,545). Hereinafter, referred to as Vargo.

With respect to claims 1 and 17, the limitations recited in claim 1, a DSP module responsive to an analog signal from one of the telephone devices and operative to convert analog telephone signal to digital telephone signal and further operative to packetize digital telephone signal for transmission to a remotely-located router device, are inherently addressed by Vargo.

Vargo discloses in Fig. 1, an operation of the Internet telephone system (communication system). Wherein, a call is initiated in North America (first telephone

device) over a PSTN gateway server 10a (router device) from a PSTN 11a over the Internet 17 (packet switching network) to Japan and Taiwan (second telephone device).

Further, according to Fig. 1, for a call to take place over the Internet (packet switching network), the received analog signal (analog telephone signal), from the call initiator (first telephone device) to the call receiver in Japan (second telephone device), must be digitized into packets (converted analog signal to digital signal) and transferred to the router (remotely-located router device) for routing packets through the packet network. Besides, all involved processes stated above are well known in the art in VoIP transmissions.

Further, Vargo discloses (col. 10, lines 46-67 and Fig. 11a) assuming the voice port begins with the commercially available TrueSpeech codec algorithm (first type of codec), which encodes speech at 8.5kbits/sec and with no redundancy.

After noticing dropped packets (detection of degradation in the quality of the voice information), the voice port adjusts by selecting (switching codec type) the Voxware 2.9kbits/sec algorithm (second type of codec) having somewhat lower sound quality (while conversation is taking place), but with two level redundancy error correction.

With respect to claim 5, Vargo discloses (col. 11, lines 18-19) that voice port 61 responds to changing network conditions (detecting lower bandwidth available on the packet switching network) to maintain speech quality. Further Vargo discloses (col. 11, lines, 20-22) that it is possible to vary the size of the individual packets or to vary the

bundling-of the packets (switching from a codec resulting in the use of larger packet sizes to a codec resulting in smaller packet sizes) by techniques that are well known in the art.

With respect to claims 6 and 8, the limitation "wherein the router device automatically detecting the lower and higher bandwidth" is inherently addressed in the rejection of claim 5. Wherein, Vargo discloses that voice port 61 responds to changing network conditions to maintain speech quality.

With respect to claim 7, Vargo discloses (col. 11, lines 18-19) that voice port 61 responds to changing network conditions (detecting higher bandwidth available on the packet switching network) to maintain speech quality. Further Vargo discloses (col. 11, lines, 20-22) that it is possible to vary the size of the individual packets or to vary the bundling-of the packets (switching from a codec resulting in the use of smaller packet sizes to a codec resulting in higher packet sizes) by techniques that are well known in the art.

With respect to claim 9, the limitation recited in claim 9 is addressed in the rejection of parent claim 1.

With respect to claim 10, the limitation recited in claim 10 is addressed in the rejection of parent claim 1. Wherein, Vargo discloses that after noticing dropped

packets (loss of one or more packets), the voice port adjusts by selecting the Voxware 2.9kbts/sec algorithm having somewhat lower sound quality, but with two level redundancy error correction.

With respect to claim 11, the limitation recited in claim 11 is inherently addressed in the rejection of claim 10. Wherein Vargo discloses that after noticing dropped packets (threshold defines the number of lost packets), the voice port adjusts by selecting the Voxware 2.9kbts/sec algorithm having somewhat lower sound quality, but with two level redundancy error correction.

With respect to claim 12, the limitation recited in claim 12, wherein a plurality of packets form a message and each packet includes a sequence number indicative of the position of the packet with respect to other packets in the same message, the sequence numbers of the same message being in sequential order, is addressed in the rejection of parent claim 1. Wherein Vargo discloses that a stream of voice data 200 includes a plurality of data packets numbered 1 through 10, where each packet further contains a plurality of data bytes indicated by the letters in Fig. 8(a) to 8(d).

The limitation, wherein a loss of packets is detected when one or more sequence numbers are missing from the received packets of the same message, is inherently addressed in rejection of claim 11. Wherein, Vargo discloses that after noticing dropped packets, the voice port adjusts by selecting the Voxware 2.9kbts/sec algorithm having somewhat lower sound quality, but with two level redundancy error correction.

With respect to claim 13, Vargo discloses (col. 1, lines 40-43) that since Internet is built to transfer data packets rather than continuous streams of sound, there may be delays and losses. Further, Vargo discloses that voice port 61 responds to changing network conditions (degradation in the quality of the voice information is due to an intolerable delay associated with the time for a packet to travel between the router device and the remotely-located router device) to maintain speech quality.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vargo.

With respect to claims 2-4, Vargo disclose (col. 4, lines 48-51) that the teleport is designed to be able to switch codecs between one data packet and the next in the same data stream.

Vargo does not disclose that wherein switching between the codes is initiated by a user of one of the telephone devices and wherein a predetermined code is assigned to each codec, the user specifies the type of codec to be switched to by entering the predetermined code corresponding to a desired codec into one of user telephone devices and predetermined code is programmably-alterable.

However, switching initiated by a user and predetermined code are well known in the art such a TV remote controller, wherein a user can select different channels to view and wherein the remote controller can be programmed to store a number of channels with associated "hot keys". Wherein, each "hot key" is corresponded with a channel and a user can press that "hot key" to turn to that specific channel. User can re-program the remote controller to different "hot keys" associated with different channels at another time.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a method of user initiating and assigned predetermined code, which is re-programmable, for each codec in Vargo's system, to increase system's functionalities.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 14-16 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art does not teach or fairly suggest that fax transmission takes place on the telephone line causing a temporary interruption to the telephone conversation thereby avoiding the need for telephone connection to be disconnected prior to the fax transmission, as specified in the independent claim 14.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chen et al (US Patent No. 5,539,908) discloses a software mechanism for installing and identifying compression/decompression procedures.

Murphy (US Patent No. 6,028,679) discloses a method and apparatus for transmitting fax image data streams over Internet Global Area Networks.

Ojala (US Patent No. 5,933,803) discloses digital speech encoding technique at variable bit rate.

Rapeli (US Patent No. 6,182,032) discloses a method of switching to a lower speech codec rate when in a non-acoustically coupled speech path communication mode.

Rosenberg (US Patent No. 6,304,567) discloses methods and apparatus for providing voice communications through a packet network.

Zhang et al (US Patent No. 6,381,266) discloses method and apparatus for identifying the encoding type of a central office codec.

Van Den Brink et al (US Patent No. 5,691,916) discloses method and device for calculating the quality of transmission media containing codecs.

Vo et al (US Patent No. 6,256,612) discloses a method of reducing speech delay and improving speech quality in digital transmissions system.

Hofmann, P et al "InGate: Integrating telephony and Internet" Protocols for Multimedia Systems, 24-27 Nov. 1997, pages 261-264.

Sheng, G. Z. et al "Intranet-Based Mail Fax Gateway Technology" Intelligent Processing Systems, 28-31 Oct. 1997, Vol. 2, pages 1607-1611.


Cox, R. V. et al "On the Applications of Multimedia Processing to Communications" Proceedings of the IEEE, May 1998, Vol. 86, Issue 5, pages 755-824.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh-Vu H Ly whose telephone number is 703-306-5675. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 703-305-4744. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

av
July 21, 2002


HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600